

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF HOMŒOPATHY.

The Agitation of Thought is the Beginning of Truth.

VOL. 8.

NEW-YORK, OCTOBER, 1853.

NO. 6.

S. R. KIRBY, M. D., EDITOR.

OBLIGATION OF THE WORLD TO HOMŒOPATHIA,

AN ADDRESS DELIVERED BEFORE THE
AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF HOMŒOPATHY,

BY EDWARD BAYARD, M. D.,
OF NEW-YORK.

GENTLEMEN OF THE INSTITUTE: The great law, upon which rests the science of Homœopathia, was not a single thought of genius caught by inspiration. It was conceived in toil. It was vindicated and established only by years of patient labor. It was not a theory eliminated in the study. It was a law—a law of nature discovered, which could be developed but through the pains and sufferings of its investigators. The man in health must sicken for its demonstration.

Every man who adopted this great principle found each step of his progress surrounded by contempt, ridicule, and persecution. Though that day is happily passing, and those trials and embarrassments (the consequence of ignorance and intolerance) are fast fading away from the path of the practitioner, yet there are men who hear me to-night who have witnessed the bitter opposition to medical reform and know it all full well. A reformer under our system must have been successful in all cases, or he was denounced as a charlatan, no matter how violent the attack, nor how incurable the disease. If the patient die, ignorance and malice eagerly put it down to a failure of his principles. The opposition is of no trivial kind. It is deeply seated in the human heart. Pride of opinion—long habits of accustomed thought—the dislike of change—and, more than all, pecuniary interest, are among the elements which make and prolong this opposition. Under the influence of these causes, within my personal knowledge, a physician, at one time received and acknowledged as a most competent practitioner of Allopathia, admitted to possess the requisite learning and knowledge of the schools, who being convinced of the truth of the Hahnemannian

law, and, from the integrity of his character, compelled to declare and practice it, was denounced by his former friends and associates of the profession, his abilities and his principles denied, and his character maligned; and while he was in the course of a successful and increasing practice, the County Medical Society, of which he was a member, cited him to appear before that body on the charge of *Quackery*. Under an old law then existing, (now, be it said to the honour of the State, repealed,) he was handed over to the public prosecutor and tried before the judges of the county. The head and front of his offending was—not that he had failed to restore his patients to health—not, when disease was alleviated, more fearful abnormal actions from his remedies had remained—not that he had hurried one single fellow-being prematurely to the grave; but that he was a practitioner of Homœopathia. He was acquitted, and is now a citizen of Cleveland, filling a professor's chair in the Homœopathic Medical College of this city.

When the light first broke on Hahnemann's mind, when as yet he only suspected but had not demonstrated the existence of the Homœopathic law, what an ocean of difficulty lay between him and the practical development of its principle! Any character less patient, less earnest, and less persevering, must have abandoned the pursuit. It required all the strong elements combined in the nature of this extraordinary man to have moved in this great enterprise. Standing on the vantage-ground of his most profound learning, looking back on the past, he saw the defects and weakness of the art as then practised, and felt that it wanted the certainty and fixed principles of a science. He wrote to all of the most learned and distinguished of his contemporaries—men in extensive practice—to inquire what knowledge they possessed of the action of drugs on the healthy man. The universal answer returned was that they had no precise knowledge, for they administered their drugs to the sick—not to those in health; and that they could not distinguish between the symptoms of the drug, if any such existed, and those of the disease for which they had administered.

All the experience they possessed was from the effects of accidental poisoning. But such knowledge was to him too crude and useless; for large doses have few and strong determinations, and thereby prevent the general expression of their specific action. Then the knowledge of the past and the experience of the present was to him of little avail. There was no real knowledge—there was no light. The whole subject was enveloped in darkness. He perceived the existence of the law; but our *Materia Medica* was to be formed; experiments must be made; and Hahnemann, the greatest discoverer, girded himself to the task.

Great on the human race have been the effects of the discovery of a continent. The discovery of steam-power may be greater. But greater still in the measure of usefulness is it to give to the world a law which shall insure for the healing of the nations. You who have tried drugs upon yourselves can appreciate the sufferings and discomforts to be endured, and know likewise that it is a work of time, and a work, if well done, to stand for all time; above the caprices of fashion and chances of change—(for medicines have had their day)—now used and recommended almost as a panacea, then doubted and laid aside. But till the golden bowl is broken, the silver cord loosened, and the vital power fled, so long, in our *materia medica*, will remedies hold the same relation to disease.

For many years, with his few disciples around him, did Hahnemann test the action of drugs on the human system in its normal state. When the great truths of Homœopathia were fully established, he kept it not to himself, but gave it to the world. One would have supposed, from the acknowledged standing of Hahnemann, the friend of Hufeland, that the announcement of his discovery would have been received with at least attention, and, especially as it was not based on hypothetical reasonings, but was a law deduced from experiments, that investigation would have been instituted. But Hahnemann did not escape the fate of Harvey and of Jenner. He was not crowned the great benefactor of the human race. Denunciation usurped the place of investigation. An old law, a dead letter on the statute-book, which made it penal for any physician to prepare his own medicine, was revived, effectually to prevent the demonstration of the truth of his doctrine. He exiled himself from his home, to carry out his researches, for in this, as in other instances, the prophet had no honour in his own country. Since that day Homœopathia has taken deep root. There have been published in the German language more than four hundred volumes, in the French language more than one hundred and fifty, in the English more than two hundred, and in the Italian and Span-

ish more than one hundred, making over eight hundred and fifty volumes written and published on this subject. We have seen, in the efforts to establish our system, expenditure of thought—toil through many years—voluntary endurance of sufferings which are paralleled only by the action of disease—sacrifices made—ridicule and dejection borne; and in view of all this, we would ask, what is the obligation of the world to Homœopathia?

We are taught by it, that all medicinal substances have a specific action on the human system. Previously to these teachings, what meagre and general knowledge existed of the action of drugs! Take, as an instance, *Sulphur*, so generally used as a domestic remedy. How little was known of its specific effects! It was prescribed by physicians. It was given by parents, under a vague notion of its being a mild alternative, without an idea of the power of this great disturber of the vital force, which Homœopathia has shown is capable of producing two thousand symptoms on the healthy organism, acting profoundly on mind and body, producing symptoms similar to those diseases called rheumatism, epilepsy, paralysis, dropsy, fevers, erysipelas, dyspepsia, diarrhoea, and dysentery; producing muscular weaknesses, local inflammations, abscesses, affections of the heart, and cerebral congestions;—in its action affecting the intellectual powers, inducing melancholy and sadness, disgusting us with life, and causing us even to despair of our eternal salvation.

But it may be asked by the uninitiated, How is this possible? Is not this substance used as a domestic remedy by almost every family? I answer, that every medicinal agent which makes an impression on the nervous system, must sooner or later produce its specific effect, not upon all parts—nor all its effects, many of those depending for their direction upon the accident that develops them. It is not a consequence that these effects should follow immediately on the exhibition of the drug. The impression may lie latent for months or years, until an exciting cause arouses it into action. Aye, like the charge of gunpowder in the solid rock, it may remain harmless for years; but when the spark shall set it free, the explosion must follow. And so the impression once made, the action will come. Witness the effect of the bite of a rabid dog. The wound may be forgotten, the scar may be erased by the years that have passed; yet madness will often follow.

As limited and vague as was the knowledge of *Sulphur* previous to the discovery by Hahnemann, was the knowledge of all other drugs prescribed in that day. Now, with these facts proven, we would ask, can drugs be prescribed with any certainty and with any safety, without the knowledge

of their effects upon the healthy man? For this knowledge mankind are indebted to Homœopathia.

What more has Homœopathia done? When an Allopathic physician seeks to produce a curative effect on his diseased patient, true to his Allopathic principle, he seeks to create other sufferings—revulsive action. Where does he urge the vital force? Does his *Materia Medica* afford him chart or compass, or give him any reliable knowledge of the direction it will take? Is he not enveloped in darkness? A distinguished Allopathic physician (grown gray in practice) truly remarked, it was like arming a blind giant with a club, whose blow might fall on the disease or fatally strike the patient. Homœopathia teaches in what direction we urge the vital current.

It is clear that without this knowledge it is impossible to discover the diseases which spring from medicinal substances; and in my belief it will be found, on critical examination, that two-thirds of the maladies that torture and afflict humanity are produced directly by, or are complicated with, the effects of medicinal substances.

In many cases that have come under my own observation, I have seen the diagnosis utterly fail from want of this knowledge. With your permission I will mention *one*. A girl was brought to me, about eight years old, complaining of vertigo. The mother stated that she had been subject to the croup, which had frequently threatened her life, from the violence of the attack;—that by the advice of an Allopathic physician of high standing in the city of New-York, she had given her *Ipecacuanha*, in Allopathic doses, with the happiest effect; for the disease was cured promptly under the remedy; and she had been in the habit of giving, by the same advice, the same medicine when the first symptoms of croup appeared. It always, with equal promptness, checked the disease; and of late the attacks of croup had grown less frequent; and the mother eulogized the remedy. But the child complained of dizziness. When walking, she would have vertigo to such a degree as to cause her to stagger. The mother stated that her physician said it was an affection of the stomach, and administered remedies for that organ, supposed to be at fault; but still the vertigo remained. He then thought it was the liver. When the diagnosis leaves doubt and perplexity, the last resort is usually to the liver. He proposed a few blue pills as an alternative. This startled the mother; and she then consulted me. Now, gentlemen, taking up our *Materia Medica*, I found the pathogenetic action of *Ipecacuanha* was, in the language of the provers, thus written: "Vertigo when walking, with tottering and staggering." This was one of its direct actions

on the brain. I gave the antidotes to *Ipecacuanha*, and the child was relieved. We see in this case, that first the vital current was determined to the throat of this child, producing the phenomenon we call croup. We see that *Ipecacuanha* used in large doses produced another disease by changing that current, and thus relieved the croup. Had that learned physician known Hahnemann's *Materia Medica*, his diagnosis would have been correct. He would have known, that in relieving the croup by such an agent, he might produce a determination to the brain. But when the prescription had removed the symptoms of croup, for which it had been given, he looked no further; for the reason that his *Materia Medica* gave no knowledge of the specific action of the drug used. But again, suppose some accident had happened to increase that tendency; suppose the child should have had a fall or blow on the head, what remedy could have checked the strongly accelerated action which would have pressed upon that important structure? Death—inevitable death must have followed. This ignorance is frightful in its consequences, and is the cause of exceeding mischief to mankind. By such means disease is altered, produced, assuming new forms and phases, like the ever-shifting figures of the Kaleidoscope. And as with the Kaleidoscope the figures will change with every turn of the instrument, in infinite variations, until it is broken; so disease may be driven from organ to organ, and with every alteration assuming new phases, until the more delicate and complicated instrument of human organization is destroyed.

For the removal of this false security, this fatal ignorance, the world is under obligation to Homœopathia.

What more has Homœopathia done? It has shown how sensitive a thing is a diseased nerve. After Hahnemann had discovered the specific action of drugs, and sought to apply them under the Homœopathic law of cure, he was still ignorant how sensitive to impressions the human system became in a morbid state; and when he gave the ordinary large doses under this new law of cure, this sensitiveness had nearly caused him to abandon the application of the law—so great was the action excited. He reduced and reduced the dose, and yet its effects were too powerful. But with that wonderful acumen and clearness of perception in tracing out nature's law, which he so eminently possessed, he continued his reductions, until he had reached that point where nature could react; and then he learned the sensitiveness of a diseased nerve—almost beyond human appreciation. Hence by induction arose the administration of the so-called infinitesimal doses—a stumbling-block in the way of those who have made

no experimental investigations. The jeering wit of the facetious allopathist expended on this point, demonstrates sorrowfully their utter want of knowledge on this important matter. It is but an attempt, contrary to all philosophy, to rebut *facts* by ridicule.

Who can estimate the number of lives sacrificed by ignorance of this fact—the power of similar irritants upon disease. I remember, before I fairly entered upon practice as a physician, a case painfully bearing witness to this truth. A young man, a fellow-student of medicine, of the fairest promise, was attacked with an ordinary disease of mumps. He was of robust constitution, and full of youthful vigour, so that those who knew him might have fairly counted that he would have enjoyed more than a usual amount of health through a long life. Without any great severity, the disease was developed with slight fever. Meeting me in the class, he asked me to give him some Homœopathic remedy to relieve him; for he had been somewhat familiar with Homœopathia, and intended eventually to practice it. Not practicing then myself, I recommended him to a Homœopathic physician. But the fear of ridicule, and the risk of not obtaining his diploma if his predilections were known, and the simple character of the disease, determined him to consult one of his professors. I had examined his case with attention, and marked how closely it resembled the action of *Mercury*; so much so, that I said to him: "Whatever may be prescribed Allopathically, do not take *Mercury*." I was convinced that if a drug thus indicated could be taken in large doses with impunity, there could be no truth in the law. The next day I called to see him, and was shocked at his altered countenance; every symptom that he had, had become more intense, and others were added. The parotid gland was more swollen and hard, pulse quick and wiry, sweat with nausea, tongue coated with tenacious mucus, breath tainted, rapid speech, trembling limbs, and mind at times slightly wandering. He arose restlessly in his bed, saying: "Do not blame me, for I have taken but one dose of *Calomet*." When I left him, I immediately wrote to his friends, that if they wished to see him in life, they must come quickly; for it was now evident that nature could never react. The third day he died, borne down to the earth, not by the disease, (for I believe if left to nature alone he would have recovered,) nor by the action of *Mercury* alone, but by the action of *Mercury* on the diseased nerve, urging it beyond the power of reaction. Thus the remedy which, if given in sufficiently minute doses would have restored the patient to health, became his destroyer. Like thousands of other cases less marked, he fell a victim for want of

the light that Homœopathia sheds on the power of drugs having actions similar to the disease for which they are administered.

Ipecacuanha will produce symptoms similar to a species of Asthma, as you, gentlemen, well know. Dr. Thomas Watson, in his lectures on the principles and practice of physic, delivered at King's College, London—a text-book in most of the Allopathic colleges—cites the case of a man who was subject to Asthma, who could not bear even the odour of *Ipecacuanha*, and was obliged to fly when the bottle was uncorked. He speaks of it as an idiosyncrasy, not recognizing it as a fact under a general law. For the light on this subject the world is indebted alone to Homœopathia.

What more has Homœopathy done? She has given to the world the great law of cure. Disease in its last analysis is but the disturbance of the vital force; death is the cessation. There are but two modes of cure; that is, two modes by which the vital force can be restored to its equilibrium—which is health. One is by revulsion, or the removal of disease by diverting its action; this is called Allopathia. The other cures disease by reaction, or exciting the reactive power of nature by a similar irritant; this is called Homœopathia. The former endeavours to restore the equilibrium, by creating a new channel for the disturbed vital force, by the use of drugs in such doses, that, partly by their mechanical irritation, and partly by their revulsive effect, the normal condition of other parts is disturbed. To produce such effects, practitioners under the former system are driven by necessity to the use of large doses. They create the new disease or irritation, under the presumption that after producing the revulsion, these effects will cease; overlooking the fact, that though mechanical irritation may cease, the drug used in such quantities to produce revulsive action, must have its specific action.

There is always a tendency in nature to restore the equalization of the vital force, if her power is not overcome by the intensity of some morbid principle. Perhaps in some acute affections from short-lived obstruction, Allopathia may hasten that equalization.

But there is a danger in the use of this mode, that should prevent a thoughtful and enlightened mind from ever adopting it. That danger, with masterly power, as if by inspiration, was pointed out by Hahnemann. I allude to his theory of chronic disease. In the range of my observation the general truth of all that he has said on that point has been fully sustained. It is the master key which unlocks and brings to light the concealed causes of profound disease that were a

mystery and bewilderment to the practitioner from the failure to perfect at once a cure which required time. Whether the causes assigned by our master are sufficient to produce the predisposition to disease, is immaterial to my argument.

We know, and any one who has seen much of diseased action must have observed, that all causes which disturb the vital power, fall upon men unequally—on some with severe consequences, producing a train of evils that they do not get rid of in years, or perhaps in a lifetime.

Two persons are thrown to the ground with equal force, and both sprain the knee-joint equally. The one applies a domestic remedy, brandy and salt. In a few days the equalization of the vital force has taken place, and the swelling and weakness disappears, and he has the free use of his limb. He calls upon his friend, and finds him still suffering, without improvement. He is surprised, and inquires, "What have you done?" "I sent for my physician." "Has he used brandy and salt?" The sufferer shakes his head, and looks at his knee. "Your physician is a fool. Use my remedy, it has cured me." The physician is dismissed, and the brandy and salt applied for days, but no improvement. If any thing, the structure has become harder and more swollen. The brandy and salt have failed. The advocate of its virtues, with the philosophy of self-sufficiency, consoles himself with the observation that the remedy was applied too late. Now the knee has assumed the character of a white swelling. Why did not the physician cure? Why did the brandy and salt relieve the one and fail with the other? The rationale is found in the fact, that in the one man there was a predisposition to disease slumbering in the system, having no locality, waiting but an accident to produce the disturbance in the vital force to give it a determination. The other, having no such predisposition, found relief from the simplest remedy.

It was this difference in human constitutions that turned the astute mind of Hahnemann to the investigation of the cause. He discovered and announced to the world the existence of three miasms or poisons, the basis of all chronic disease, which might exist latent in the system, derived from inheritance or by infection. These miasms have no limit to their duration, against them the unassisted vital force can never react; nor has revulsion ever the power to restore equilibrium. Revulsion may give the vital force new channels, but can never cure. It only changes the form of disease, and renders the system by that change more feeble and less able to react. Few of our fellow-beings are free from this chronic malady in some form.

With great propriety does Hahnemann

remark, "The more I examine the ordinary cures, the more I am convinced that they are not direct transformations of the disease treated into health, but revolutionizings, disturbances of the order of things by medicines, which, without being actually appropriate, possessed power enough to give matters another (morbid) shape. These are what are called cures." "The hysterical ailments of yonder lady were successfully removed by me." "No, they were only changed into a Metrorrhagia." After some time I am greeted by a shout of triumph. "Excuse me! I have also succeeded in putting a stop to the Uterine Hemorrhage." "But do you not see, on the other hand, the skin has become sallow, the white of the eye has acquired a yellow hue, the motions have become grayish white, and the urine orange-colored. And thus the so-called cures go on like the shifting scenes of one and the same tragedy."

Again, there exists another strong objection to Allopathic treatment. There is a principle of self-preservation impressed by the Deity on vitality, determining all irregular movements of the vital power outward and to the surface, thereby protecting the nobler organs essential to human existence. Its tendency is to place the disease upon that point where, under the circumstances, it would be least injurious to the organism. This is nature's law. Hence the inevitable result of revulsion does not assist nature in expending the force of disease where it can be best borne, but weakens her efforts, and thereby forces her back upon the internal structures which it has been her great struggle to avoid. Allopathia then is not only an unreliable, but a dangerous mode of cure.

Let us now examine the Homœopathic system, and its results. Gentlemen, we have said that the ultimate analysis of disease is the disturbance of the vital force. How then does Homœopathia seek to restore the equilibrium, which is health? By administering a remedy which produces in the healthy person symptoms like the disease. On what principle can this effect a cure? We have said there was a tendency in the vital force to equalization, which always exists unless prevented by violence or the impression of a poison. It is a fixed principle of the vital force to resist and react against all that has a tendency to disturb it; and the power of resistance to disturbing impressions increases with every successful effort. This is a principle of every-day observation. A man plunges into cold water, which disturbs the vital force; it recoils from the surface. If the impression is not too violent, it reacts. If the plunge is repeated, the impression made is not so great, the resistance being greater. With every plunge the impression lessens, and resist-

ance increases, until no disturbance is produced. It is on this principle of increased resistance that the virus of the small pox makes little impression after vaccination, and scarlet-fever, measles, and whooping-cough cease to be contagious to those who have recovered from their infection. It is on this principle that men may breathe with comparative safety the dreadful malaria of the African coast. This increased power of resistance is the principle of acclimation. The air we breathe, filled as it is with disturbing agents, by the principle of resistance and reaction, gives vigor and tone to the system; and the enervated denizens of the city, who seek on the sea-coast the salt breezes from the ocean, to renovate their exhausted frames, find strength from this principle alone; for we know that the pathogenetic effect of seasalt is to produce great weakness and relaxation of the physical and moral powers. This principle of increased strength from reaction—increased power of resistance—is the law of growth physically and morally, from the unfledged bird which, by repeated efforts, gathers power to rise, to the child whose mind expands under the use of its powers of observation and reflection.

It is to this principle that Homœopathia owes the power and permanency of her cures. We administer to the disturbed vitality, checked and delayed in its power to react by some abnormal influence, a similar irritant, just sufficient to excite and rouse resistance. This principle, so beautiful in its simplicity, so true in its keeping with the known laws of nature, so perfect in its cure, exhibits a strong contrast in the results of the relief given by Allopathia and the cures effected by Homœopathia. In the former, the patient rises from disease enfeebled by the movement which revulsion has created, and which the weakened powers have yet to struggle against, perhaps for years; chronic maladies being developed by the debility and the remedies exhibited. In the latter, the patient rises from disease, the vital force equalized and strengthened by the reaction, and the power of resistance increased.

Certainty in prescription is not the least benefit conferred on mankind by Homœopathia.

She relies not upon hypothesis for the seat of disease, but, untrammelled by the errors incident to suppositions, looks to the symptoms alone (the true indices of disease), and in their totality sees the image which, with unerring certainty, indicates to the practitioner the remedy demanded. Not so with Allopathia. She leaves her practitioner on the wide field of conjecture, and ingenious hypothesis alone directs her remedies.

It is a grave and serious matter to haz-

ard human life on conjecture. I remember the case of two men who were engaged in the active business of life, and were seized at the same time with symptoms similar in their character. One was placed under Allopathic, and the other under Homœopathic treatment. The practitioners of both systems believed they had encountered an incipient bilious fever. The Allopathist adopting his hypothesis, proceeded by cathartics to evacuate the bowels, so as to relieve the obstruction of the liver, and used the lancet to reduce the fever. The Homœopathic physician, not governed by hypothesis, turned, according to the genius of his system, to the symptoms, the signals that distressed nature held out, and grouping them into a picture, sought the corresponding remedy. In a short time the ultimate characters of the disturbance was manifest. In their conjectures regarding the nature of the disease, they had been mistaken. It was small-pox. The Allopathist saw his mistake; but it was too late. Nature, robbed of her powers and enfeebled by depletion, could not then maintain the disease upon the surface; and the patient died, a victim to the error of human judgment. The Homœopathist also perceived the error of his diagnosis; but this error did not affect the patient, for the symptoms, and not hypothesis, had controlled the remedies administered, and there could be no mistake in his treatment. Had his first conjecture as to the nature of the disease been realized, he could not have prescribed otherwise; and nature, unembarrassed and strengthened, struggled successfully through a confluent small-pox.

From this great law of cure, "*Similia similibus curantur*," is derived the certainty of prescription.

I pause here a moment, gentlemen, with your permission, to correct a mistaken and prevalent impression, which my remarks might seem to favor. There are some simple souls who think that it is an easy thing to practice Homœopathia. That a box and book alone are necessary. This is a capital error. It is not an easy thing to draw from the patient an accurate account of his sufferings. That requires knowledge of character and patient examination; for some will magnify, while others will suppress; some will be exact, and some loose, in their expressions. To direct your questions so as to elicit the precise truth, requires both tact and judgment. It requires also both judgment and experience to group properly the symptoms, to know what morbid cause is at work, whether one poison or many, and how complicated. For this, knowledge and research are essential. It is not an easy thing to estimate the power of the system to react, whether it will be prompt or sluggish; yet this must be understood and determined.

before we can repeat the dose. It is not without difficulty we can determine whether chronic malady or predisposition is aroused by an exciting cause and become part of it. Study and reflection are necessary in the selection of the similimum. The structure must be known—its physiology and pathology—its relative value. In fine, all that is required of the Allopathist must be known, except his "receipt-book," and more, much more. True, our agents can be seen and may be understood, but let not the uninitiated think that with little learning they can be skilfully used.

Is it not strange, that in this world of ours, where the treasures of knowledge are obtained only on the condition of experiment and reflection, that learned medical men, acknowledging the weakness of their system, should meet the announcement of the discovery of a law of cure so all-important to the human race, with denial and ridicule, based on arguments drawn from their own theories, without experience, without taking one step in investigating the new field discovered? The absurdity of such a course is aptly illustrated by a conversation related by Captain Marey, between a Delaware and a Camanche, in his late expedition through the Indian country. It appeared that the former had stated to the latter the fact of the sphericity of the earth's surface. This idea, being altogether new and incomprehensible to the Camanche, was received with much incredulity. After gazing for a moment at the Delaware, to ascertain if he was sincere, he asked if that person took him for a child, or if he looked like an idiot. The Delaware said, No, but the white people, who knew all about these things, had ascertained such to be the fact. He added, that the world was not only round, but that it revolved round the sun. The Camanche very indignantly replied, that any man of sense could, by looking off on the prairies, see at a glance that the earth was level; and moreover, that his grandfather had been West to the end of it, where the sun passed down behind a vertical wall.

The Delaware continued, in his simple, but impressive manner, to describe to the Camanche the operations of the steam-engine, and other objects of interest he had seen. All of this the Camanche regarded as an effort of a fertile imagination, expressly designed to deceive him; and the only reply he deemed to make was an occasional exclamation in his own language, the interpretation of which the other pronounced to be, "Hush, you fool!" "I then endeavoured," says Captain Marey, "to explain to the Delaware the operation of the magnetic telegraph; and in illustrating its practical utility, told him that a message could be transmitted a thousand miles and an answer returned in

ten minutes. He seemed much interested in this and listened attentively to my remarks, but made no comments, until I requested him to explain it to the Camanche. He smilingly said 'I don't think I will tell him that, captain, for the truth is, I don't believe it myself.' What excited the contempt in the mind of the savage? The difficulty was, he drew his inference from his own limited knowledge and his own traditions, rejecting the new facts upon their mere announcement.

But a truly scientific mind is, by its very acquisitions, rendered teachable, as in the case of my learned friend, Dr. Benjamin F. Joslin. Before his attention was attracted to the discovery made by Hahnemann, an Allopathic physician of standing having written a tirade against Homœopathia, sent it to the most learned and distinguished of the medical men of this country, requesting their opinion on the subject, and among others to Dr. Joslin; who deferred answering, on the ground that he could not give an opinion until he had investigated the new system experimentally. To prepare himself to express an opinion worthy a man of science, he commenced a series of experiments upon himself, to test the truth of the specific action of drugs, and then proceeded to test the law of cure. The result was the conviction of the truth of Homœopathia. So, gentlemen, must it always be, when this great subject is fairly examined.

We have seen that the world is indebted to Homœopathia for the discovery of the pathogenetic and specific action of drugs; for the knowledge of the sensitiveness of a diseased human nerve to similar irritants; for certainty in prescribing a dose that is a medicine, and not a poison; and for the great law of cure.

Immortal honor to the man who was the discoverer! Yet upon that great head has been showered vituperation and abuse; his investigations ridiculed, and their results denied without examination; his deep learning undervalued; he himself characterized as a charlatan. All that blind prejudice, selfish interest, and sordid avarice could do was done. But it is manifest, from the rapid and wide-spread advance of his principles that the justice which his contemporaries denied, will be fully awarded by posterity.

HAHNEMANN'S LATEST PREPARATIONS.

To the Editor of the Homœopathic Times.

SIR,—I have received communications from several of our professional brethren, in which they complain that they have seen little or no effect from Hahnemann's latest preparations. I am very sorry to hear of their non-success, as I am con-

vinced that the trials were made in a very candid spirit. My experience differs from theirs, and I can only forcibly repeat that which I have often urged before, namely, that *correct* choice is a *sine qua non* of success with these and similar preparations. Almost everything turns upon that, and as every professional homœopath must be presumed to be able to make a tolerably correct choice, I cannot give any other direct answer to their complaints. Possibly there may be persons who are not susceptible to the influence of these preparations, but they are undoubtedly very rare exceptions.

An interesting case, in which the efficacy of these preparations cannot be doubted, occurred in my practice very recently, and I beg leave to communicate it. I repeat, I only wish to prove the effect of these preparations, and nothing more. A lady, aged about forty-two, had long been a martyr to "rheumatic gout," and suffered from a confused variety of symptoms, very clearly less the effects of natural disease than those of *Hydriodate of Potash*, of which she had made, under medical advice, an unwarrantable abuse. Some months ago a very great domestic affliction affected her to an almost uncontrollable degree. Under these influences the nipple of the right mamma became painful, opened in the centre, and a fungous excrescence made its appearance; it gave no great trouble, except that it very readily bled on being rubbed against the dress. Finally, the bleeding became more and more profuse, and her relations insisted upon medical advice. I found the excrescence had been coming on for about six weeks, was of the size of a small pea, resting on a stem; looked very turgid and of a bright red color, and had been bleeding almost the whole of the preceding night. I gave *Lycopodium* 0-12, one globule in seven tablespoonfuls of water, a tablespoonful every morning. In about a fortnight she wrote to say that three or four days after commencing the medicine, the "tumor" began to shrink and wither, and finally fell off at the stem; that since then the nipple had closed, and looked like the other; that her appetite and other functions were much better, and her spirits improved. I make no further comment on this case, but only add my conviction, which experience strengthens every day, that *if medicines are selected with care and judgment*, these preparations act more satisfactorily, particularly in chronic cases, than any others with which I am acquainted.

But I may give my correspondents an indirect answer, and if this cap fits them and their experiments, I trust they may turn it to useful account. It is this: those who know little of Homœopathy, particularly of its *Materia Medica*, or who have fallen into the fatal routine habits now so pre-

valent among the practitioners of this country, or those who shun hard study, should never meddle with these preparations. Nor should those who give habitually two medicines alternately; or who, as we read in serious journals, give *three* remedies "alternately"; or, better still, give two medicines (for instance, *Corrosive Sublimate* and "*Tr. Arsen.*") alternately, and at the same time put "*some Aconite* into the toast-water allowed for drink," in cases of dysentery; nor those who have reached that crowning height of slovenliness and folly, "courses" of homœopathic medicines, *i. e.*, where a man calling himself a homœopath, ay, and sailing perhaps even under Hahnemann's colors, prescribes at random, without rhyme or reason, three, four, five, and more different medicines at a time, to be taken in succession, and trusts to chance that one or the other may hit some symptom or other, at some time or other. Prostituted as Homœopathy has been in this country, to a degree which must make the blush of indignation burn in every honest man's cheek, I am sure nobody thought it possible, a few years ago, that "improvements and reforms" could be pushed so fast and so far as to reach the height of such a libel, not upon science, but upon common sense and common honesty.

Among those who ought not to meddle with Hahnemann's latest preparations, are our "*Nux* and *Sulphur* men," as also those quick gentlemen who have treated 254 patients "in a long day"; or those who upon the decrees, and under the sanction of "Homœopathic Congresses," smear ointments on eruptions, purge, blister, cauterize, to their hearts' content, and indulge in other crude follies, which seem to form at present an integral part of "homœopathic practice." Sir, it must now be a matter of serious thought to those who understand, love, and admire that splendid and highly-refined science, Homœopathy, and its illustrious Founder, what will eventually become of it and his name, through the raw, unphilosophical handling which they suffer from a great proportion of its professional and non-professional adherents. Under the baneful influence of that great public nuisance, the *Domestic Medicine Books*, and other *pontes asinorum*, the true spirit in which homœopathic science ought to be investigated and cultivated, is getting rapidly and thoroughly vitiated. It would be a curious thing, Sir, to ascertain how many of the last ten years' professional "converts" have ever studied, nay, read through, nay, possess, Hahnemann's "*Organon*," "*Materia Medica*," "*Chronic Diseases*," and "*Lesser Writings*," and with how many the study and knowledge of Homœopathy is based upon anything better than these stolid "*Domestics*," and perhaps *Jahr's Manual*.

Under all these circumstances, can we feel astonished that comparatively so little success attends the present practice of Homœopathy—that patients lose their confidence and return to Allopathy—that the progress of homœopathy, among both the professional and non-professional public, is miserably slow—that the bright name of Hahnemann is getting tarnished, through the egregious folly of his disciples, and that the latter are obliged to shout lustily for “allopathic auxiliaries” of every sort? Sir, those who have truly penetrated into the meaning of that glorious science which Hahnemann left us, who have seen how he practised Homœopathy and have witnessed his success, cannot but feel deeply grieved at the barbarian spirit which has made such an unblushing irruption into our beautiful fields, and has well-nigh turned them into a bear-garden. Sir, let us make a manly effort to prevent the disastrous result to which Homœopathy is being rapidly led, and, with God’s help, we may succeed yet in rescuing our beloved Master’s name and a fair science from the imminent peril of being lost in the muddy waters of Allopathy.

Faithfully yours,

Sept. 10, 1853. CHARLES LUTHER.

THE PRINCIPLE OF HOMŒOPATHY.

BY WILLIAM SHARP, M.D., F.R.S. LONDON.

DR. SIMPSON says, “In medicine and surgery we have *many general facts or laws*, more or less correctly ascertained and established, and the art of medicine consists in the practical application of these laws to the relief and cure of the diseases of our patients. These laws are some of a higher, some of a lower type of generality. As examples of them we have, for instance, the law that various contagious diseases, more particularly eruptive fevers, seldom attack the same individual twice during life, and the practical application of this law in artificial inoculation with small-pox and cow-pox has already saved millions of human lives. As a general law, *Cinchona* has the power of arresting and curing diseases of an intermittent or periodic type, as intermittent fever or ague, intermittent neuralgia, etc. As a general law, the employment of *Opium* arrests and cures irritative diarrhœa, *Iron* cures chlorosis, etc., etc.”*

In the name of natural science I protest against such an abuse of its expressions as is here made. If its most valuable terms are to be applied in so vague a manner, there is an end to all precision of either thought or language. If the term “general

law” is to be understood as meaning nothing more than that things *generally happen so and so*, the further discussion of the subject will be vain and unprofitable.

Dr. Simpson, endeavoring to extricate himself from this confusion of ideas and misapplication of words, goes on to say, “But the law laid down by Hahnemann, and which forms the groundwork of Homœopathy—viz. *similia similibus curantur*—is regarded by him and his disciples not in the light of a general law, but as a *universal* and infallible law in therapeutics.” Here it is evident that the word *general* is made to mean the same as *generally*, as if they were connected, as the words *frequent* and *frequently* may be; but a “general law” in this sense is a contradiction in terms; a “law generally but not always” is no law at all in nature. The word “general,” when applied to a law of nature, means the same as “universal.” A natural law must be universally applicable *within its sphere of action*;—a *real* though not an *apparent* exception would destroy its claim to be received as a law. Homœopaths speak of their law as thus general or universal.

But the confusion in Dr. Simpson’s mind continues as he proceeds. “For one,” he says, “I am most willing to admit, that if Hahnemann, or any man, could discover a single universal, infallible law in therapeutics, applicable to all diseases and all cases of disease, it would constitute the greatest imaginable discovery in medicine. Many men have in the same way fancied that they have discovered a single infallible *universal remedy* for all diseases. Priesnitz thought his cold water was such, Morison averred that his pills were such, and so on.”

How strange the confusion of thought in this sentence! What relation does the attempt to cure all diseases by a single remedy, as in the instance of hydropathy, bear to the attempt to discover, by philosophical inquiry and fair induction, a general fact or law of nature calculated to guide us in the application of all remedies? An uneducated but vigorous peasant might undertake the one, but only an accomplished physician could hope to effect the other. And how can Dr. Simpson place a laborious scientific inquiry, carried on openly in the face of Europe by Hahnemann, side by side with the advertisements about his secret pills and their infallible virtues by Morison? This evidences a lack either of discernment or of candor; if the former, it displays such a want of discrimination as entirely unfits him for the task he has undertaken; if the latter, it betrays him into such a misrepresentation of things as equally disqualifies him on another ground.

Dr. Simpson admits that the discovery of a general principle to guide us in the

* Simpson’s “Homœopathy, its Tenets and Tendencies,” p. 2, 37.

application of remedies in disease would be a great discovery; but he has no sympathy with those who are laboring to find out such an invaluable guide. He does not, indeed, say with Dr. Paris that the discovery is impossible, but he breathes no fervent aspiration that suffering humanity may receive such a boon. He does not engage in the search himself, any more than Dr. Paris, nor has he a word of encouragement to induce others to engage in it. He expresses no gratitude to Hahnemann for his indefatigable exertions, nor regret that they should have been persevered in for so many years, as he thinks, in vain.

There is nothing enviable in a frame of mind like this,—so destitute of generous admiration of the struggles of an ardent spirit to obtain some light to illuminate his path in the conscientious discharge of his professional duties,—so devoid of ingenuous pity and brotherly regret, while he thinks that those aspirations and exertions have ended in a failure!

But other men have had other views and feelings, and have come to a different conclusion. Sydenham, the father of British physicians, writes thus:—

"I conceive that the advancement of medicine lies in the following conditions.

"There must be, in the first place, a history of the disease,—in other words, a description that shall be at once graphic and natural.

"To draw a disease in gross is an easy matter. To describe it in its history, so as to escape the censure of the great Bacon, is far more difficult.

"It is necessary, in describing any disease, to enumerate the peculiar and constant phenomena, apart from the accidental and adventitious ones; these last named being those that arise from the age or temperament of the patient, and from the different forms of medical treatment. It often happens that the character of the complaint varies with the nature of the remedies, and that symptoms may be referred less to the disease than to the doctor. * * No botanist takes the bites of a caterpillar as a characteristic of a leaf of sage.

"The other method whereby, in my opinion, the art of medicine may be advanced, turns chiefly upon what follows, viz., that there must be some fixed, definite, and consummate *methodus medendi* (law or method of cure), of which the commonweal may have the advantage. By *fixed, definite* and *consummate*, I mean a line of practice which has been based and built upon a sufficient number of experiments, and has in that manner been proved competent to the cure of diseases. I by no means am satisfied with the record of a few successful operations either of the doctor or

the drug. I require that they be shown to succeed *universally under such and such circumstances.*"*

Such are the earnest thoughts of Sydenham. It is true he looked for this "method of healing" in a direction in which success has not yet been attained. He hoped to find it in a *theory of disease*. "It is known," he says, "that the foundation and erection of a perfect and definite *methodus medendi* is a work of exceeding difficulty." In this direction two thousand years have been spent in unsuccessful efforts. Hahnemann turned to another quarter, and, as Dr. Scott has beautifully explained, he found a *method* in a *theory of cure*.

The practitioner who professes to take this law for his guide in the treatment of disease must obey it with loyalty, and trust it with confidence within this extensive territory. If he bleed and blister in simple inflammation, if he give purgatives in simple chronic constipation, he is without apology. The law will guide him effectually and securely, if it be obeyed, through all such troubles as these. Such additions do more than, in the language of Johnson, "encumber us with help,"—they are unnecessary and injurious.

This brings us to the consideration of so-called *auxiliaries*. The term is improper and ought never to be applied.

Here is a magnet and a piece of iron; when the magnet is brought sufficiently near the iron, and the iron is free to move, it is drawn up against gravity and adheres to the magnet. This is a fact illustrating the action of the magnetic force. Suppose a weight is put upon the piece of iron, and the magnet made to approach it as before—now there is no apparent action; the magnetism of the bar has not departed, but the conditions requisite for its visible manifestation are not granted—there is a mechanical impediment. Now suppose the impediment is removed with the hand, and the conditions thus restored, the action again takes place. Can the *hand* in that case be called an *auxiliary* to the magnetic force? It is obviously an improper term; we cannot help or assist a natural force, though we may often remove impediments or assist in producing the circumstances or conditions under which the force naturally acts.

We must reject the term *auxiliary* altogether. If applied to bleeding and purging in inflammation, both the act and the term are wrong; such additions to true homœopathic treatment are not needed—they are not *auxiliaries*, but *hindrances*. If applied to what is required to be done for those parts of cases which are

* Works of Sydenham. Vol. i. pp. 12-17. Sydenham Society's Edition.

beyond the limits of the law of Homœopathy, it is wrongly applied; where the law does not reach it cannot act at all, and therefore cannot be assisted.

Within the limits of the law of Homœopathy nothing should be added to the remedy indicated, except what is manifestly calculated to promote the comfort of the patient; appropriate food, clothing, temperature, air, water (cold or warm), and cheerful and kind attendants. *

What those cases are which are *beyond the limits* of this law, and how they are to be treated:—

These outlying cases, or parts of cases, like stragglers beyond the camp, are a disorderly group, which have given a great deal of trouble to the homœopathic practitioner, because he has not seen clearly how to deal with them. They have constituted a great practical difficulty. Let us try to subdue them to order and submission. We will take them *seriatim*, following the maxim of Rochefoucauld, "Pour bien savoir les choses, il en faut savoir le détail." To understand a subject we must go into particulars.

There is a class of cases of which the following is an instance. A man is heartily and hastily enjoying his dinner; he swallows the bone of a fish, and it lodges in his throat; the practitioner is sent for in great haste—the man is choking. What dose of a like remedy can help in such a case? It is true there are medicines homœopathic to the pain and incipient inflammation, but their action would be kept in abeyance, just as the force of gravity cannot bring the apple to the ground while it is supported by the twig. No, the *mechanical impediment* in both instances must *first be removed*, the twig must be broken—the bone must be extracted, and then, the required conditions being granted, the respective laws will operate.

Another class is represented by the following cases. A railway accident, unhappily by no means unfrequent, has scattered abroad a number of poor creatures with broken arms and legs, dislocated shoulders and ancles, and wounds of all kinds. It is true the homœopathic medicines will be of great service, but there are other requirements—fractured bones must be replaced in their natural positions, and be retained there; dislocated joints must be reduced, wounds must be closed with sutures and plasters, perhaps bleeding vessels tied; and bandages must be skilfully applied. All the presence of mind and practical tact of the medical attendant will be put in requisition. His applications will be much fewer in number, his apparatus much less complicated, than were those of his forefathers, so graphically depicted in the glorious folio of Ambrose Pare, but

something of this kind must always be required; to treat such cases single-handed is plainly beyond the power of Homœopathy; but Homœopathy will do its own part, and do it well—*within its own province it will need no help.*

We proceed to another class of cases. A patient is suffering from inflammation of the bladder; the physician prescribes *Cantharides*, the remedy is perfectly homœopathic to the inflammation, but it fails to afford relief. On more careful examination a stone is found in the bladder; its presence is the cause of the inflammation; it is a mechanical impediment to the action of the remedy. The forceps is again required, the stone is removed, and the patient recovers. The failure of *Cantharides* in this case is no reproach to Homœopathy; it would have cured had there been no such impediment.

It will be said that all these are *surgical* cases, and that the homœopathic physician is not concerned with them. I grant that they are *called* surgical cases, and that Hahnemann himself excepts them as such; but the distinction between the surgeon and the physician is an artificial division of the medical staff which ought never to have arisen. It did not exist among the Greeks and Romans, but originated in the dark ages, and I hope it will cease to exist in the future; that practitioners will study the whole of their profession, and seek only the distinction of superior skill and experience. At any rate, all should first be physicians, and surgery should be the super-added part.

In another class of cases we meet with strictures of the natural passages. In these cases there is the diseased condition of the part, which can be prescribed for homœopathically, but *but there is something more*; there is a mechanical impediment to the free passage of what ought naturally to be allowed entrance or exit. In the case of the œsophagus it is clear that solid food must be abandoned, and only liquids swallowed; in the case of the rectum, something must be done to produce liquid evacuation. Now homœopathic medicines restore health, their tendency is to bring a disordered action into a natural state; but a natural state, a healthy action, is inadmissible in these deplorable cases, and consequently something must be given to produce an *unnatural* state, as the only condition on which life can be for a short time prolonged. This case, then, requires an aperient, but it is evident that the aperient is not given with any view of curing the patient; it has no pretension of that kind; its object is simply to accommodate nature to a mechanical difficulty. Should homœopathic remedies diminish the disease, and the stricture disappear, the necessity for a liquid diet in the one case, and for aperients in the other, would cease.

These cases are happily very rare, but when they do occur, the medical adviser should explain their nature clearly, and especially his motive for having recourse to aperients.

Other cases, the opposite of those last noticed, will be met with. I lately saw an elderly lady who was in the act of losing an enormous quantity of dark blood from the bowel: her life was in great jeopardy. The rectum was distended with hard matter. Two things were immediately done; the medicine which I conceived was most homœopathic to my patient's condition was given, and, by an enema of water, the mechanical impediment to the contraction of the bowel was removed. The hemorrhage ceased instantly, and never returned. Now I acted here strictly as a homœopathist should act. I gave nothing but the homœopathic remedy; but had I contented myself with this, my patient must have died. On the other hand, removing the mechanical difficulty was not having recourse to Allopathy, it was in the strictest keeping with the purest Homœopathy, and I took care that the friends of my patient should understand the nature of the case.

Again, a child fills its stomach with poison-berries or with pastry, or a man swallows accidentally or intentionally a quantity of poison in a solid state; shall not warm water, or an emetic, or the stomach-pump, as may seem to be most called for, be immediately made available to remove the offending matter? In some of these cases magnesia, or white of egg, or camphor, or some other *antidote*, may be required to neutralize, chemically or vitally, the poisonous substance. The remainder of the case will fall within the limits of the law, and the proper homœopathic remedies can be given.

Again, cases of fracture of the spine, where there is, of course, total paralysis of all the parts below the fracture, require a mechanical mode of relieving the bladder, during the brief remainder of life.

Again, cases of dropsical effusion may demand the removal of the accumulated water, not as a remedy for the dropsy, but that the distress caused by its bulk and mechanical pressure may, for a time at least, be relieved. For a similar reason it will sometimes be desirable to remove simple tumors by an operation. Malignant tumors, having an origin in constitutional disease, should not, I think, be operated upon. They may be benefited by homœopathic treatment; but the forcible removal of them subjects the sufferer to a painful operation, and tends to shorten rather than to prolong life. We have the testimony of experienced allopathic surgeons to this fact.

It will be evident, on a careful study of all these cases, that none of them are cases for which Homœopathy is not adapted. We hear it said, from time to time—such a

case is not suited to Homœopathy; there are no such cases. Every case of disease is suited to Homœopathy, and Homœopathy is adapted to every case. It will be observed that it is for a *part only* of these cases that Homœopathy is not suited. It is perfectly competent to act within its own sphere, in every case of disease; that which, in any case, lies beyond this sphere, if we follow the dictates of right reason, must be treated by other means. They are chiefly mechanical difficulties which require to be mechanically removed. A few are chemical.

The homœopathist need not be ashamed of these things; he must avow them; he must explain them; he must, of all men, be open and straightforward, and do everything in public. Nothing can damage Homœopathy, or the character of homœopathists, so much as clandestine proceedings.

But what shall be done with those "bites of the caterpillar," to which we have seen that Sydenham, nearly two centuries ago, compared the mischief produced by the deleterious doses of allopathic drugs?—*The bites of the caterpillar!* What must be done with them? They are very difficult to deal with. I will describe what I did, a few months ago, with a case of this kind.

In the beginning of November last Mr. H., aged about thirty-eight, married, of a nervous temperament, not feeling quite well, consulted his physician, complaining chiefly of nervousness. *Mercury*, *Hyoscyamus*, and *Digitalis*. In large doses, along with other medicines, were prescribed for him. The next day he felt worse, the medicines were repeated, and others added. He continued to get worse, the drugs were continued; he took to his bed; another physician was called in, in consultation, and the drugs repeated. When he had been three months in bed; was emaciated to the last degree; was suffering from bilious diarrhœa; his heart beating as if it would break his ribs, 140 times in a minute; his head confused; the mercury and foxglove being still continued, and belladonna added in large and frequently repeated doses—his wife was told that she must expect the worst. He had taken mercury and foxglove for five months, together with henbane, capsicum, columba, ammonia, opium, valerian, camphor, sulphuric acid, quinine, ether, assafoetida, colocynth, nitric acid, dandelion, Prussic acid, hop, poppy, cod-liver oil, rhubarb, deadly nightshade, Epsom salts, senna, etc., etc. These medicines had been prescribed, in the order here given, with various salines and infusions, by these two highly respectable physicians, between the 13th of November and the 26th of March, in as many separate prescriptions now in my possession. What could I do? I advised him to try to take

some food, and to abstain from all medicine for a week. At the end of the week he was a little better, but had been greatly agitated the day before by the stormy visit of one of his former physicians. I prescribed *Sulphur* for him, and in about two months, by attention to diet, and by taking a few doses of *Nux Vomica*, *Sulphur*, *Nitric Acid*, and *Cinchona*, I had the pleasure of leaving my patient quite well, and he soon afterwards resumed his occupation, upon which a family was dependent.

Before I conclude, I must not omit to notice one class of cases which remains, and which Hahnemann reminds us common sense excludes, in the first stage of their treatment, from the domains of Homœopathy. They are, in fact, not cases of disease, but of privation of life;—I allude to suspended animation by drowning, or any other kind of suffocation. Persons in this condition do not need healing of disease, but, if possible, restoring to life. Whatever means are most likely to be conducive to this end must be diligently used by the homœopathist. If he should happily succeed in these efforts, and any ailment then exist in his patient, his rule comes into action, and he treats his case accordingly.

COMMENTS from us on the address of Dr. Bayard, delivered before the American Institute of Homœopathy, at its session in June last, at Cleveland, Ohio, which we publish in this number, are uncalled for, as the subject is so important, and is so ably discussed, that our readers will not fail to carefully read the address, which cannot but tend to lead the unprejudiced mind to look upon the doctrines and practice of Hahnemann as one of the good things bestowed upon the world.

Dr. Sharp's article is an able production, which we recommend to the notice of those would-be-thought homœopathists, who diminish confidence in *similia similibus curantur*, by supposing, without any grounds whatever, that there may be another therapeutic law; in fact, some of whom go so far as to deny that *like cured by like* is applicable to all diseases universally.—Such practitioners have scarcely left Allopathy, yet they do not perceive their real position. We hope that such writers as Sharp, Luther, and Bayard may open their eyes to see clearly the truth as developed by Hahnemann.

HIGH DILUTIONS NOT INOPERATIVE.

The title "high," as usually understood, a misnomer.

BY D. WILSON.

It is somewhat to be regretted that terms should ever have been employed by Hahnemann or his disciples, the use of which unconsciously involves a useless theory that can serve no practical purpose, and which only tends to steel the shaft of ridicule—a mighty engine that is ever wielded to serve the purpose of the crafty opponents to progress.

Had the Master Genius, Hahnemann, been spared to us a while longer, he would no doubt have continued to direct the energies of his clear and great mind to the correction of all such hindrances, and much more, to the advancement of his curative law. We only wish he could have been amongst us now, painful and distressing as it would have been for him to see his grand and beautiful system so wofully prostituted by the rude hands of men calling themselves his *scientific* (!) followers; but the day is not far distant, we trust, when effective means will be devised to set the public as well as the medical profession generally aright as to the true merits of his doctrines and practice. It must afford every sincere follower of Hahnemann encouragement in the struggle for truth, to see that the *Homœopathic Times* does not stand alone in its advocacy for pure and unmixed practice, by which only can the Homœopathy of Hahnemann, which is indeed scientific, be tested. When the subject of the magnitude of the dose has been mooted, some "pilule," or what I should call "*bullet*" practitioners, who prefer "great things" to small, have pointed to two or three cures performed by Hahnemann in his early career with drop-doses and mother-tinctures, but it was convenient for these gentlemen to forget to add that Hahnemann subsequently wrote—

"The praise bestowed of late years, by some few homœopathists, on the large doses, depends on this, either that they chose low dynamizations of the medicine to be administered, as I myself used to do twenty years ago, from not knowing any better [what a rebuke and moral lesson to us!], or that the medicines selected were not perfectly homœopathic." (*Dr. Dudgeon's translation of the Organon.*)

To those practitioners who still point to these two or three cases so treated by Hahnemann as a justification for their proceedings, I should feel disposed to respond in agreement with Mr. Everest, who, when he once answered this remark formerly, said, if the author of Homœopathy now lived, he questioned if he would sanction

such practice as a model to be followed. If we will but carefully digest his writings, we shall discover that he himself soon saw the unsatisfactory character of such practice, and most wisely corrected it. It was from no whim or dogma that Hahnemann reduced the doses of medicines, as almost every page that he has written confirms. In his introductory observations to *Cinchona*, he says, "I was led to the use of such small doses neither by prejudice nor caprice; experience and observation induced me to abolish the larger doses, which, even when they cured, acted still more powerfully than was necessary. I therefore substituted smaller doses in their places, and continued to reduce the doses until I had arrived at a point in my *sub-divisions* of the original substance where the curative action of the dose was justly proportioned to the disease, without producing any unnecessary medicinal symptoms."

Perhaps the present may not be an unfitting opportunity for me to be permitted to digress briefly from the object with which I began to write. The word "*cure*" is one that we constantly hear, which is a most fallacious misnomer likewise, as Dr. Joslin has very clearly pointed out, in his forcible illustration of the difference between *RECOVERY* and *CURE*, and it is one that ought ever to be borne in mind by the professional homœopathist as well as the amateur, and the public who submit themselves to a constitutional treatment for some chronic, deeply-rooted, troublesome affection, ever changing in its character, and influenced by every change of temperature as well as by mental emotions. I would also most anxiously solicit the attention of allopathic followers to Hahnemann's definition of "*cure*," which may lead them to sound reflection on the subject of "*heroic*" doses, in which too many of the homœopathic body have inclined, without *one atom* of evidence to support their unjustifiable conduct. Hahnemann writes:—

"When I say '*cure*,' I mean a recovery undisturbed by secondary ailments. Or do practitioners attach a different meaning to the word '*curing*,' which is unknown to me? Do they mean to consider intermittent fevers, which had been *suppressed* by means of *Cinchona*, cured? I know that almost all typical diseases, and also all intermittent fevers, although they do not correspond to *Cinchona*, may be *suppressed* by powerful doses of *Cinchona*; but does this suppression mean that the poor sufferers are cured? Has not their original disease been converted to a worse one, which does not, indeed, return at separate periods of an equal duration, but which is continuous, though more concealed? The patients do no more complain of the regularly outbursting type of the fever; but behold the livid color of their bloated countenances, the dimness of

their eyes! Behold how asthmatic they are; behold their hard and distended abdomen, the hard swelling of their loins, their lost appetite, their repulsive taste, the oppression which every nourishment produces in their stomachs; behold their undigested and unnatural evacuations, their anxious, unrefreshing sleep, interrupted by all sorts of dreams! See how they crawl about, as it were, faint, joyless, desponding, susceptible, out of humor, and stupid, tormented by a greater quantity of ailments than was caused by their intermittent fever! How long does such a *Cinchona* disease frequently last, which can only be relieved by death!"

Where is the practitioner, who has had ample experience as an allopath, I should like to know, that cannot call to mind many similar pictures of medicinal disease over which he has had to mourn, and of which he must be painfully reminded by the suggestive portrait so correctly delineated by the sagacious and observant Hahnemann? It is scarcely possible to read twenty pages of allopathic practice without encountering many similar analogies in the creation of drug-diseases, horrible and unmanageable drug-diseases, through massive and incongruous combinations of potent medicinal agents administered for the cure of simple disease. Such cases of drug-misery have, I candidly confess, come under my observation repeatedly while practising as an allopath, and there is nothing like a practical lesson. It was in the year 1848, some years after I had had my mind directed to drug-diseases, and had been practising Homœopathy, *four* distinct cases in confirmation of what Hahnemann has so truthfully depicted came under my notice.

One patient had anasarca of the lower extremities from *suppressed* ague. Another had been taking *wine* and *bark* for *eighteen months*, to recruit his strength, after a severe attack of "*nervous fever*," with no other effect than that of rendering him still more nervous, depressed, weak, and unfit for any duty—truly ill in fact. Under the use of appropriate antidotal treatment, which at the best is a very difficult and often an unsatisfactory sort of practice, his change for the better was most gratifying in eight days, when he had lost much of his nervousness and sleeplessness, and also a suspicious tickling cough, which was accompanied with a stitch in the side. At the end of fourteen days he wrote: "I am happy to say I feel much better. I must indeed say I have reason to have every confidence in the system of Homœopathy." The treatment of the *Cinchona*-anasarca was a much more tedious and troublesome affair, and required many months to restore the balance of lost health.

From the administration of "*heroic*" doses of quinine, with the view to cure a

somewhat sharp periodical headache, I have seen the father of a family rendered deaf, paralytic, the subject of confirmed drug-disease, and a corpse in fifteen months, leaving a respectable widow and young family to mourn their loss, with the consolation, "Ah, poor soul, everything was done for him that human means could devise!" Poor consolation this for a bereaved widow and her young family! True, all was done that limited knowledge could supply, but not in accordance with Hahnemann's beautiful and truthful law of cure. The time, in my opinion, is not far distant when the intelligent public will even demand before coroners' juries a detailed statement of what treatment was followed, under which death resulted. The very self-satisfied expression of the "*usual means were employed without effect*" will cease ere long to be admitted as anything like satisfactory evidence. There are in store more ways than the slothful, imperious, scornful, and ignorant dream of, to bring them to their senses, and in none do I see so powerful an engine "looming in the distance" as the accurate and persevering indoctrination of the public with correct notions of Homœopathy and her trustworthy pioneers, through two or three good tracts. Indolent and careless practitioners, who style themselves homœopaths, require no less to be put upon their mettle than the allopaths.

To return to my subject on the question of the dose simply, for I shall have hereafter to touch upon the worst of all vile abominations under the name of Homœopathy, the quick and successive alternation of two, three, or more remedies within a few hours. We have, independent of our own experience, Hahnemann's own authority to support us in the belief that medicines prepared in the homœopathic form, given in a state approaching to material quantity, but not homœopathic to the case at all, will by frequent repetition act allopathically, and thus, on the principle of establishing a mild medicinal disease, *different* from the natural disease, bring about a "recovery," through the organic system having been unfettered of a natural disease at the expense of a mild medicinal disease, which the recuperative powers of the system can more readily throw off than it can a natural affection. The morbid force in this compound action would seem to have been broken. All this, however, is mere theory, as Hahnemann himself admits; so that we must appeal to experience, and ask whether such be facts. Should any of my readers doubt the power of attenuated medicines to produce suffering, if not homœopathic to the case—for some have had the dangerous idea instilled into them that if the homœopathic medicines do no good they will do no harm—I would recommend them to take a few globules of the 30th dilu-

tion of any drug properly prepared, every day for fourteen days or a month, and to make their report to the *Homœopathic Times* at the end of that time. I venture to say they will cease to harbor longer any such egregious fallacies, which they may have imbibed from some impure source, on this head. I have tested the 30th dilution, and even the 200th dilution, of several medicines upon myself to my heart's content, and all I can say is, with much physical and mental suffering that few would voluntarily endure. It will be seen that I do not discountenance the use of low preparations because I think them useless, but the reverse, most dangerous; as likely, in the hands of the slothful, half-read homœopaths, to establish symptoms which are not recognized as belonging to the drug, and which therefore become game for him to pepper away at with additional remedies. This is no exaggeration, but a fact that I shall endeavor to make plain, before I have done, from modern records of homœopathic "*recoveries*." "The reason," says Hahnemann, "why the homœopathic doses have such an uncommonly powerful effect is this: that the organism is not obliged to expel them in the same sudden and violent manner as the large doses prescribed by allopathic physicians. And even those small doses, *if they are not strictly homœopathic*, invite nature to artificial evacuations, which shorten the action of the remedy."

Where could we find, I should like to know, stronger or clearer language that forcibly demonstrates the recognition of an allopathic action by the *unhomœopathic* administration of medicines employed in homœopathic practice? Hence numerous cures of dangerous cases of croup and so forth, under a most barbarous and random system of medication, under the name of Homœopathy, can be most legitimately accounted for, and on no other principle than Allopathy. This is a subject that we must meet face to face with those who differ with us, for we are prepared to show that it is not Homœopathy, although a more elegant combination of Allopathy, with an occasional spice of the former; and once admit it to be a fair representation of Hahnemann's Homœopathy, the sooner the *Organon* and other valuable writings of the Founder are burned the better, and then let each man apply himself to the interpretation of nature for himself.

No doubt it is such loose and disgraceful conduct as this mode of practice illustrates that has confirmed Sir John Forbes in the opinions he has expressed, and to which I will direct the attention of your readers before I have done with this subject. Space compels me to close my observations for the present, but I trust to furnish you with further observations from Hahnemann's writings, and cases from my own

practice, which will warrant me in the course I have adopted. I openly and frankly declare, sooner than lend myself to the monstrous delusion that is being foisted on the public and the fair name of Hahnemann and his glorious system of scientific and refined practice, by a system of spurious practice, not in the least homœopathic in its character, I would rather quit the sphere of such charlatanry altogether.

It behoves men who have seen the errors of Allopathy, and who have had the honesty and courage to make an open avowal and clean breast, not to enter upon homœopathic practice until they have been satisfied of its truth, and feel themselves able, by dint of hard application, to adopt the new mode, rather than jeopardize a noble system of medical science. Let all who have a conscience rather adopt the practice of Dietl or the *médecine expectante* of the French school, until they have prepared themselves for the unceasing labors and trials imposed upon all those who would follow Hahnemann.

YELLOW FEVER.

MADISON, IND., Oct. 14, 1853.

S. R. KIRBY, M.D.

SIR,—The enclosed communication, addressed to the Madison (Ind.) Courier by my friend Dr. HOLCOMBE, is replete with valuable statistical information on the homœopathic treatment of yellow fever. Please insert the same in your wide-spread Journal, that all the friends and adherents of true Homœopathy may learn and know of its triumphant success in that dreadful disease. Yours, &c., respectfully,

J. B. HUTCHINSON, M.D.

NATCHEZ, (MISS.) Sept. 24.

M. C. GARBER, Esq.

SIR,—You published in one of your late papers, a telegraphic despatch, stating the remarkable success of Homœopathy in the treatment of yellow fever. In a subsequent issue, under a very exaggerated telegraphic report from Natchez, you intimate your fears that the homœopathic remedies have not gratified our sanguine expectations. If the report were true, your apprehension would be very well founded; but instead of four hundred inhabitants, there are, at least, two thousand remaining in the city.

There have been fully one thousand cases of yellow fever, within the limits of the corporation. Contrary to the precedent of former epidemics, the disease has spread to a considerable extent in the surrounding country. It may be fairly estimated, that up to date, 1200 cases of yellow fever have been treated by the physicians of Natchez. Of this number, 300 and a fraction over have been buried, according to official reports. As the subject of homœopathic practice is one of vast importance to the health and happiness of mankind, a few thoroughly authenticated statistics thereon may be interesting both to you and your readers.

Dr. Davis and myself have treated homœopathically 345 cases of yellow fever, with a mortality of 19—at least one half of whom had been previously drugged under the old system, and who came into our hands in doubtful, and 203 cases in hopeless, conditions. This shows a loss of about 1 in 18—a success unparalleled in the annals of allopathic medicine. Similar success has been met with in New Orleans, Rio Janeiro, the West Indies, and wherever pure Homœopathy has been used in the management of the disease. Deducting our list of patients and deaths (to the accuracy of which we have an abundance of witnesses) from the highest supposed number of cases, and the known number of deaths, the allopathic physicians have had between 800 and 900 cases, and 280 deaths, indicating a mortality ranging from one-fourth to one-third—a result perfectly accordant with the workings of that practice in New Orleans.

The good friends of Homœopathy here have been riveted to the system by triple bars of steel, and many of its bitterest opponents have been convicted and converted. Indeed, the whole south-west has been roused to an appreciation of its merits, and its thorough adaptability to the most malignant southern diseases. Its searching trial and triumphant success, in Natchez, is but a miniature picture of what is progressing more slowly throughout the civilized world. The whole history of Homœopathy, its scientific origin, its tardy reception, its gradual extension, its repeated trials, its constant triumphs—all evince that it is founded on the indestructible basis of truth. Yours, sincerely,

W. H. HOLCOMBE.